



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,495	08/17/2005	Peter Zahradka	81190-1802	8552

7590 10/18/2007
Ade & Company
1700-360 Main Street
Winnipeg Manitoba, R3C 3Z3
CANADA

EXAMINER

PAGONAKIS, ANNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

4173

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/507,495

Applicant(s)

ZAHRADKA ET AL.

Examiner

Anna Pagonakis

Art Unit

4173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1 sheet.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election of Group II and chronic renal failure filed on 9/28/2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Applicant's amendment filed on 09/28/2007 has been received and entered into the application. Accordingly, claims 1-2 have been cancelled and 5-6 have been withdrawn and no claims have been amended, or added.

Claims 3-4 are presently under examination and are the subject of this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of the designation "PPAR α " renders the claims indefinite as the recitation is too vague. "PPAR α " is a simple acronym/abbreviation that has many different meanings in the art and thus the inclusion thereof renders the claims indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Considering that claims 1-14 are drawn to a method of treating, preventing or ameliorating the symptoms of a PPAR α related disease the said claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the claimed method of treating chronic renal failure does not reasonably provide enablement for a method to prevent chronic renal failure.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. In In Re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph have been described. They are herein discussed in view of the instant invention.

The nature of the invention

Applicant claims a method of treating, preventing and ameliorating the symptoms of chronic renal failure by administering a PPAR α agonist

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art

The state of the prior art is that it involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities (i.e. what compounds can treat or prevent which specific diseases). There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic or preventive regimen on its face. Moreover, there is no prior art disclosing the prevention of said disease.

The instant claimed inventions are highly unpredictable as discussed below: It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the prevention of said disease is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would need to carry out experimentation to determine if any of the multiple claimed compositions, are indeed active against Parkinson's disease and if as a consequence, the said treatments can be achieved. Moreover, the specification lacks to show a method of treating said subjects need to undergo in order to prevent said disease.

The level of skill in the art

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability of the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be

Art Unit: 4173

individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine a method of determining the subjects that would certainly suffer from the said conditions or diseases and a method for showing that a method wherein the said subjects are subjected to the claimed compounds in order to achieve the claimed prevention.

Thus the specification fails to provide sufficient support for the said prevention methods. Thus, one of skill in the art would have to perform an exhaustive experimentation in order to practice the claimed compounds.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2nd 1001, states that “a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion” and “[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable.”

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test whether the said disease can be prevented in the instant claims, with no assurances of success.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 4173

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ahlem et al. (USPGPub 2003/0060425).

Ahlem et al. teaches that the compounds of formula I which can behave as a PPAR agonist or antagonist (paragraph [0682]). Furthermore, "the formula I compounds are useful for preventing, slowing the progression of or treating chronic renal failure in a subject" (paragraph [0709]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anna Pagonakis whose telephone number is 571-270-3505. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday, 9am to 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AP

Ardin H. Marschel 10/15/07
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER